



A defendant may move to dismiss any claim against it if the plaintiff fails to prosecute, fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or fails to comply with a Court order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Court may also dismiss an action for failure to obey a discovery order under Rule 37(b)(2). In determining whether dismissal is appropriate, the Court should consider "(i) the degree of personal responsibility of the plaintiff; (ii) the amount of prejudice caused the defendant; (iii) the existence of a history of deliberately proceeding in a dilatory fashion, and (iv) the existence of a sanction less drastic than dismissal." *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989). However, these four factors "are not a rigid four-prong test," and "the propriety of a dismissal . . . depends on the particular circumstances of the case." *Id.* at 95. Furthermore, "[r]igid application of these factors is unnecessary if the district court provided an 'explicit and clear' warning that the failure to comply with the order would result in dismissal of the case." *Bailey v. Edwards*, 573 F. App'x 268, 269 (4th Cir. 2014); *see also Coles v. Northcutt*, 574 F. App'x 268 (4th Cir. 2014) ("[G]enerally, a district court does not abuse its discretion in dismissing an action when a party fails to comply with a reasonable court order after being warned of the consequences of neglecting the court's direction.").

Courts are given broad discretion to manage an MDL docket containing voluminous cases. *See, e.g., In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Prod Liab. Litig.*, 496 F.3d 863, 867 (8th Cir. 2007). Because MDLs were created by Congress to encourage efficiency, "MDL courts must be able to establish schedules with firm cutoff dates if the coordinated cases are to move in a diligent fashion toward resolution by motion, settlement, or trial." *Id.* (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the transferee court has "greater discretion to organize, coordinate and adjudicate its proceedings, including the dismissal of cases for failure to comply with its orders." *Id.*

### **III. Discussion**

A completed PFS contains basic facts required by Defendants to assess the quality of the claims, and a Plaintiff's failure to provide such information may result in prejudice to a Defendant. *See, e.g., Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1234 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[T]he purpose of the Plaintiff's Fact Sheet was to give each defendant the specific information necessary to defend the case against it, and that without this device, a defendant was unable to mount its defense because it had no information about the plaintiff or the plaintiff's injuries outside the allegations of the complaint.”); *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867 (“Given the time pressure on a defendant that must investigate the claims of nearly 1,400 plaintiffs, we consider the danger of prejudice substantial.”). Moreover, a Plaintiff's delay or failure to provide a complete PFS may impact the other Plaintiffs in this litigation “by unfairly diverting the time and attention of the court away from their timely claims to that of [these plaintiffs].” *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867.

Here, Defendants have engaged the Deficiency Dispute Resolution Process and, under these circumstances and in light of CMO No. 5, the Court finds that granting the motion to dismiss is appropriate.

#### IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Defendants' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 7922) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's claims are **dismissed without prejudice**, subject to reinstatement upon the service of an executed and completed PFS pursuant to the procedure set forth in CMO No. 5, paragraphs 22 through 26.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Richard Mark Gergel  
Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

September 17, 2025

Charleston, South Carolina